



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,546	06/27/2003	Yohei Mackawa	116210	7424
25944	7590	09/11/2007		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			EXAMINER CHANG, JULIAN	
			ART UNIT 2152	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/11/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/607,546

Applicant(s)

MAEKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Julian Chang

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/25/03-02/28/07.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to communication filed on 06/27/07. Claims 1-64 are pending, and have been examined.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
3. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 37-44 are objected to because of the following informalities: The dependency of claim 37 on claim 35 appears to be erroneous. In order to expedite prosecution, claims 37-44 will be examined as being dependent on claim 36. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2152

5. Claims 17, 25, 26, 37-44 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claim 37 recites the limitation "the method according to claim 35" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Moreover, claims 37-44 are rejected for reciting both an apparatus and a method of using that apparatus. A claim is considered indefinite if it does not reasonably apprise those skilled in the art of its scope.

7. Claim 17 recites the limitation "claims 18" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8. Claim 25 is indefinite. It is unclear what the storage stores. It is suggested that applicant rephrase claim 25.

9. Claims 17 and 57 recite the acronym "SSDP" is not clearly defined in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2152

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 46-49 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Venkatraman, et al (US 5,956,487), hereinafter "Venkatraman".

11. Regarding claims 46-47 and 53, Venkatraman teaches a system comprising:

a link information storage that stores link information indicative of a location of data to be output (col. 7, lines 1-15); and

a link information transmitting system that transmits the link information to an information output device when said electronic device is selected by the information output device (col. 7, lines 30-51),

the information output device obtaining and outputting the data to be output in accordance with the link information transmitted from said link information transmitting system (col. 7, lines 1-15).

12. Regarding claims 48, Venkatraman teaches a system comprising:

a link information storage that stores link information indicative of a location of data to be output (col. 7, lines 1-15); and

a link information transmitting system that transmits the link information to an information output device when said electronic device is selected by the information output device (col. 7, lines 30-51),

Art Unit: 2152

the information output device obtaining and outputting the data to be output in accordance with the link information transmitted from said link information transmitting system (col. 7, lines 1-15), said information output device including a printer unit that prints out data on a recording medium (Venkatraman: col. 4, lines 17-28).

13. Regarding claim 49, Venkatraman further teaches a plurality of links (Fig. 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 18, 20-32, 36-41, 44, 45, 58-61 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman, et al (US 6,198,479), hereinafter "Humpleman", and further in view of Venkatraman.

15. Regarding claim 1, Humpleman teaches a system comprising:

an information output device comprising:

a detecting system that detects a plurality of electronic devices connected to a network system (col. 10, line 67 – col. 12, line 67); and

a selecting system operable by a user to select at least one device from among a plurality of electronic devices ('select and control a plurality of diverse devices to communicate and perform a service', col. 2, lines 25-26).

Humpleman fails to explicitly teach transmitting and outputting link information contained in link information storage.

However, Venkatraman teaches transmitting and outputting link information contained in link information storage (Fig. 1B and col. 7, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit and output link information contained in link information storage as taught by Venkatraman in the system of Humpleman with motivation to allow a user to access information contained in the webpage of a device manufacturer.

16. Regarding claim 27, Humpleman teaches a system comprising:

an server comprising:

a detecting system that detects a plurality of electronic devices connected to a network system (col. 10, line 67 – col. 12, line 67); and

a selecting system operable by a user to select at least one device from among a plurality of electronic devices ('select and control a plurality of diverse devices to communicate and perform a service', col. 2, lines 25-26).

Humpleman fails to explicitly teach transmitting and outputting link information contained in link information storage.

However, Venkatraman teaches transmitting and outputting link information contained in link information storage (Fig. 1B and col. 7, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit and output link information contained in link information storage as taught by Venkatraman in the system of Humpleman with motivation to allow a user to access information contained in the webpage of a device manufacturer.

17. Regarding claim 36, Humpleman teaches a method comprising:

detecting a plurality of electronic devices connected to a network system (col. 10, line 67 – col. 12, line 67); and

selecting at least one device from among a plurality of electronic devices ('select and control a plurality of diverse devices to communicate and perform a service', col. 2, lines 25-26).

Humpleman fails to explicitly teach transmitting and outputting link information indicative of a location of data to be output.

However, Venkatraman teaches transmitting and outputting link information indicative of a location of data to be output (Fig. 1B and col. 7, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit and output link information contained in link information storage as taught by Venkatraman in the system of Humpleman with motivation to allow a user to access information contained in the webpage of a device manufacturer.

Art Unit: 2152

18. Regarding claim 58, Humpleman teaches a system comprising:

an information output device comprising:

a detecting system that detects a plurality of electronic devices connected to a network system (col. 10, line 67 – col. 12, line 67); and

a selecting system operable by a user to select at least one device from among a plurality of electronic devices ('select and control a plurality of diverse devices to communicate and perform a service', col. 2, lines 25-26).

Humpleman fails to explicitly teach receiving and outputting link information.

However, Venkatraman teaches transmitting and outputting link information (Fig. 1B and col. 7, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit and output link information contained in link information storage as taught by Venkatraman in the system of Humpleman with motivation to allow a user to access information contained in the webpage of a device manufacturer.

19. Regarding claims 2-5 and 25, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 1 above, including transmitting link information from an electronic device when said device is selected (Venkatraman: col. 7, lines 1-15).

Art Unit: 2152

20. Regarding claim 6, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 5 above, including a plurality of links (Venkatraman: Fig. 3).

21. Regarding claims 7 and 59, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 6 and 58 above, including:

a display system that displays the plurality of links (Humpleman: Fig. 7); and

a link selecting system that selects one of the plurality of links displayed ('select and control a plurality of diverse devices to communicate and perform a service', col. 2, lines 25-26).

22. Regarding claim 8, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 6 above, including transmitting a plurality of links and corresponding pieces of service information for services provide by an electronic device (Humpleman: Fig. 11).

23. Regarding claim 9, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 6 above, including transmitting a plurality of links and corresponding general information for functions provide by an electronic device (Humpleman: Fig. 11).

24. Regarding claims 11 and 60, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 4 and 58 above, including detecting electronic devices via reply signals transmitted by the electronic devices in response to a searching signal (Humpleman: col. 10, line 67 – col. 12, line 67).

25. Regarding claim 12, 28 and 37, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 1, 27 and 36 above, including transmitting link information based on the operational states of each of a plurality of electronic devices (Humpleman: col. 10, lines 1-43).

26. Regarding claims 18 and 61, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 1 and 58 above, including a printer that prints data to be outputted on recording medium (Venkatraman: col. 4, lines 17-28).

27. Regarding claims 20, 29 and 38, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 1, 28 and 37 above, including outputting web page data associated with at least one URL (Venkatraman: col. 7, lines 1-15).

28. Regarding claims 21, 22, 30, 31, 39 and 40, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 1, 28 and 37 above,

including storing data to be outputted inside each electronic device (Venkatraman: col. 7, lines 14-23).

Moreover, a predetermined device connected to the network system can be the device itself.

29. Regarding claims 23, 32 and 41, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 22, 31 and 40 above, including sharing data to be outputted among a plurality of electronic devices (Venkatraman: The exemplary URL is a generic URL for HP service contracts. It would have been obvious to share such a service contract among a plurality of HP printers. col. 7, lines 14-23).

30. Regarding claim 24, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 1 above, including varying data outputted in accordance with the status of an electronic device (Humbleman: col. 10, lines 1-43).

31. Regarding claim 26, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 25 above, including transmitting output information only to information output devices among a plurality of information output devices (Venkatraman: col. 3, lines 50-60) that request said output information. (Both

Art Unit: 2152

Humpleman and Venkatraman teach the transmission of output data only when requested to do so).

32. Regarding claim 44, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 37 above, including a request for link information (Venkatraman: col. 7, lines 1-15).

33. Regarding claim 45, Humpleman teaches a method comprising:
detecting a plurality of electronic devices connected to a network system (col. 10, line 67 – col. 12, line 67); and
selecting at least one device from among a plurality of electronic devices ('select and control a plurality of diverse devices to communicate and perform a service', col. 2, lines 25-26).

Humpleman fails to explicitly teach transmitting and outputting link information indicative of a location of data to be output.

However, Venkatraman teaches transmitting and outputting link information indicative of a location of data to be output (Fig. 1B and col. 7, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit and output link information contained in link information storage as taught by Venkatraman in the system of Humpleman with motivation to allow a user to access information contained in the webpage of a device manufacturer.

34. Regarding claim 63, Humpleman teaches a system comprising:

a server comprising:

a detecting system that detects a plurality of electronic devices connected to a network system (col. 10, line 67 – col. 12, line 67); and

a selecting system operable by a user to select at least one device from among a plurality of electronic devices ('select and control a plurality of diverse devices to communicate and perform a service', col. 2, lines 25-26).

Humpleman fails to explicitly teach receiving and outputting link information.

However, Venkatraman teaches transmitting and outputting link information (Fig. 1B and col. 7, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit and output link information contained in link information storage as taught by Venkatraman in the system of Humpleman with motivation to allow a user to access information contained in the webpage of a device manufacturer.

35. Claims 10, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman-Venkatraman as applied to claims 5, 12 and 18 above, and further in view of what was known in the art at the time of applicant's invention.

36. Regarding claims 10, 16 and 17, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 5, 12 and 18 above, but fails to teach the use of the UPnP protocol.

Official notice is taken that the use of the UPnP protocol would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention. See MPEP 2144.03.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the UPnP protocol in the system of Humpleman-Venkatraman with motivation to allow a user to easily network various electronic devices.

"Moreover, if a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond that person's skill". See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1731 (2007).

37. Claims 13-15, 33, 34, 42, 43 and 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman-Venkatraman as applied to claims 12, 28 and 53 above, and further in view of Hemphill, et al (US 6,167,448), hereinafter "Hemphill".

38. Regarding claims 13, 33, 42 and 54, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 12, 28, 37 and 53 above, but fails to teach the transmission of link data based on a predetermined change of operation status of an electronic device.

However, Hemphill teaches the transmission of link information in response to an event triggered by a change in the operation status of an electronic device ('ENM may also include a URL', col. 2, lines 10-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include URL information in an event message as taught by Hemphill in the system of Humpleman-Venkatraman with motivation to provide further information relating to the particular event.

39. Regarding claims 14 and 55, Humpleman-Venkatraman-Hemphill teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 13 and 54 above, including a predetermined condition being on of: (a) an electronic device being in an error state; (b) a consumable member of the electronic device being less than a predetermined amount; and (c) a replacement member of each electronic device being required to be replace (Hemphill: col. 5, line 41 – col. 6, line 16).

40. Regarding claims 15, 34, 43 and 56, Humpleman-Venkatraman-Hemphill teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 13, 33, 42 and 54 above, including transmitting a method of coping with a predetermined condition (Hemphill: col. 5, line 41 – col. 6, line 16).

41. Claims 19, 35, 62 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman-Venkatraman as applied to claims 1, 27, 58 and 63 above, and further in view of Mann, et al (US 6,654,801), hereinafter "Mann".

42. Regarding claims 19, 35, 62 and 64, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 1, 27, 58 and 63 above, but fails to teach the transmission of output data via email to at least one email address.

However, Mann teaches the transmission of event notifications via email (col. 8, lines 56-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit event notifications via email in the system of Humpleman-Venkatraman with motivation to notify a system administrator at a remote location.

43. Claims 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkatraman as applied to claim 48 above, and further in view of Humpleman.

44. Regarding claim 50, Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 48 above, but fails to teach transmitting a plurality of links and corresponding pieces of service information for services provide by an electronic device.

However, Humpleman teaches transmitting a plurality of links and corresponding pieces of service information for services provide by an electronic device (Humpleman: Fig. 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a plurality of links for services provided by an electronic device as taught by Humpleman in the system of Venkatraman with motivation to allow a user to select and control a plurality of electronic devices.

45. Regarding claim 50, Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 48 above, but fails to teach transmitting a plurality of links and corresponding pieces of service information for services provide by an electronic device.

However, Humpleman teaches transmitting a plurality of links and corresponding general information for functions provide by an electronic device (Humpleman: Fig. 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a plurality of links for functions provided by an electronic device as taught by Humpleman in the system of Venkatraman with motivation to allow a user to select and control a plurality of electronic devices.

46. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkatraman as applied to claims 48 above, and further in view of what was known in the art at the time of applicant's invention.

47. Regarding claim 52, Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 48 above, but fails to teach the use of the UPnP protocol.

Official notice is taken that the use of the UPnP protocol would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention. See MPEP 2144.03.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the UPnP protocol in the system of Venkatraman with motivation to allow a user to easily network various electronic devices.

“Moreover, if a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond that person’s skill”. See KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1731 (2007).

48. Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman-Venkatraman-Hemphill as applied to claims 56 above, and further in view of what was known in the art at the time of applicant’s invention.

49. Regarding claim 57, Humpleman-Venkatraman-Hemphill teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 56 above, but fails to teach the use of the UPnP protocol.

Official notice is taken that the use of the UPnP protocol would have been obvious at the time of applicant’s invention. See MPEP 2144.03.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the UPnP protocol in the system of Humpleman-Venkatraman-Hemphill with motivation to allow a user to easily network various electronic devices.

“Moreover, if a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond that person’s skill”. See KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1731 (2007).


Conclusion

50. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julian Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-8631. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JC


BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
9/4/7